

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of July 26, 2007, claims 16, 18 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Furthermore, claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 7,187,692 B1 (“Ooya et al.”).

In response, Applicants have amended claims 16, 18 and 21 to overcome the section 112, first paragraph, rejections. In claims 16 and 21, the term “*start point in time*” has been replaced with the term “*predefined moment*”. In claim 18, the cited terms “*a data free pre-data supply period in time*” and “*a data free post-data supply period of time*” have been deleted.

In addition, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Ooya et al. Claims 4 and 5 have also been amended. As amended, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al., as explained below. In view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of the amended independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16, as well as the dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-23.

In responding to the Office Action, Applicants have amended the specification to delete references to specific claims.

### I. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 8, 12 and 16

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites “*wherein the time differential between said predefined moment and each of said transmission start moments*”

*includes the sum of a common discrete delay period and a number of waiting time periods,”* which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Ooya et al. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The cited reference of Ooya et al. discloses an information communication system in which each slave station, e.g., the slave stations 301, 401, 501 and 601 shown in Fig. 3, generates a time slot number and a delay time number. As described in column 4, lines 44-50, the time slot number and the delay time number are used to transmit an ID response signal from a slave station to a master station 101. Each possible start moment for a slave station to transmit an ID response signal is defined by the time slot number and the delay time number, as illustrated in Fig. 3 of Ooya et al. Each delay time is computed from the start of a particular time slot. As an example, the slave station 401 in Fig. 3 has generated a time slot number “2” and a delay time number “2”. As illustrated in Fig. 3, the delay number “2” for the slave station 401 is computed from the start of the time slot “2”. Thus, in the system of Ooya et al., the time differential between a predefined moment, such as at the end of the ID request signal 191 shown in Fig. 3, and each possible start moment for a slave station to transmit an ID response signal includes a number of time delays,  $\Delta T_d$ , and a variable delay period that is defined by the number of preceding time slots from that possible start moment. Consequently, the cited reference of Ooya et al. does not disclose “*wherein the time differential between said predefined moment and each of said transmission start moments includes the sum of a common discrete delay period and a number of waiting time periods,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 8, 12 and 16, which recite limitations similar to the limitations of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claims 8, 12 and 16 are also not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al., and request that the amended independent claims 8, 12 and 16 be allowed as well.

## II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-23

Each of the dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-23 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Breitfuss et al.

Date: October 26, 2007

By: /thomas h. ham/  
Thomas H. Ham  
Registration No. 43,654  
Telephone: (925) 249-1300